



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 113

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1967

No. 172

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:
Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding.—Proverbs 3: 5.

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our Father, unfailing source of light and life, we thank Thee for Thy presence which gives power to Thy people and courage to Thy children. With Thee may we find strength in the time of trouble, deliverance in the hour of temptation, and serenity in the moment when we wrestle with worry.

Save us from false ambitions and feverish activities, from plans and policies which are contrary to Thy will, and from a foolish trust in our own powers. Turn us to Thee in all humility that Thou canst forgive us and heal us and lead us in paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake.

Teach us to love Thee with all our hearts and our fellow man as ourselves. Give us such a measure of Thy spirit that we may be used by Thee to usher in a greater day for our country and a better day for all mankind. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On September 29, 1967:

H.R. 10738. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

On September 30, 1967:

H.R. 13026. An act to extend through March 1968 the first general enrollment period under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (relating to supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged), and for other purposes.

On October 2, 1967:

H.R. 472. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase certain land from Texas Southmost College, Brownsville, Tex.

On October 3, 1967:

H.R. 12257. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and expand the authorization of grants to States for rehabilitation services, to authorize assistance in establishment and operation of a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults, and to provide assistance for migrants.

On October 5, 1967:

H.J. Res. 853. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

On October 21, 1967:

H.R. 3979. An act to amend section 6409 (b) (1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General; and

H.R. 11722. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes.

On October 23, 1967:

H.R. 11456. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

On October 24, 1967:

H.R. 678. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3973. An act to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 10509. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 516. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arlington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4772. An act to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4903. An act to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and further insists on its amendments Nos. 58, 59, and 67, requests a further conference with the House, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. HRUSKA as conferees on the part of the Senate.

NE
THE DEMIBERATE SINKING OF AN ISRAEL SHIP BY THE COMMUNIST PUPPET REGIME OF GAMAL NASSER AND ITS RELATION TO H.R. 10915, REDUCTION OF EXTRA-LONG-STAPLE COTTON QUOTA

(Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, while the attention of the Congress has been occupied with the serious problems of Government spending at home, the developments in the Vietnam war, and the hippie march on Washington over the weekend, a very

H 13931

serious incident has occurred in the Middle East—the deliberate sinking of an Israel ship by the Communist puppet regime of Gamal Nasser. The Israel Government rightfully retaliated by destroying the fuel which helps feed the war machine of the Egyptian aggressor. The Soviet Union immediately announced its support of Egypt and requested the United Nations Security Council to declare Israel the aggressor. As usual the Communists are 180 degrees out of phase.

I urge our administration to make it clear that the United States of America supports Israel in its great struggle and to emphatically notify the world that our word is not only good in the Far East—it is good in the Middle East. We should also stop buying goods and raw materials from the Egyptian Government as it is obvious that they use the dollars earned in trade with this country to purchase arms and ammunition from the Communists for use against Israel. The Members of the House will have a chance to vote on H.R. 10915 today, reduction of extra-long-staple cotton quota, which has a direct bearing on this important issue.

THE HONORABLE JAMES A. RHODES

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to put the Republicans on notice that I am about to make a speech praising a Republican. The Governor of my State, the Honorable James Rhodes, is a Republican, and I believe it is to his eternal credit that down in the Virgin Islands he alone among the Republican Governors had the intestinal fortitude not to change his position on Vietnam that he had taken 2 years before, but to assert that he still supported the U.S. troops in Vietnam, and still supported our position. He did not follow the will-o'-the-wisp in hunting votes that some of them did by their rather vague meanderings indicating arrangements to sort of desert our troops out there. And I believe his position will look better and better the closer we get to the election of next year.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I hope that my friend from Ohio will pass the word that he has just indicated over to some of the Democratic Senators on the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. HAYS. I believe the distinguished minority leader well knows that I have not been bashful in criticizing some of these Democrats, and even in naming their names, and I will continue to do that from time to time.

HATCH ACT VIOLATIONS IN THE LOUISIANA DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, since bringing to the attention of the House yesterday the action of the Federal Government in making plans to send Federal civil service workers in violation of the Hatch Act to oversee as poll watchers the November 4 Democratic primary in Louisiana, I believe the House would be interested to know that the Federal Government has now issued instructions to the Federal agencies in Louisiana that they should not answer any inquiries from anyone, from the press or anyone else, with regard to their plans; that they should refer all inquiries to the Civil Service Commission in Dallas and allow answers, if answers are indeed to come forth, to come from the civil service office in Dallas.

If no more attention is to be given to replying to their requests for information than the Attorney General has given me in answering my request as to whether or not this was so, and what plans would be made, or were being made to prosecute civil service employees who violated the Hatch Act, then no answer will be forthcoming.

My colleague, the dean of the Louisiana delegation, EDDIE HEBERT, from New Orleans, told me this morning by telephone that he had directed the same inquiry to the Attorney General and the Attorney General has not even seen fit to answer his request either.

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. O'HARA of Illinois' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CONTINUING RESOLUTION LIMITING FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

(Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, of course, the House is aware of the issue involved in the continuing resolution; namely, that Federal expenditures for which appropriations have not yet been enacted are limited to last year's levels. The Members are also aware of the fact that expenditures in the last fiscal year were \$125.7 billion.

In the resolution that is still pending in the other body, the figure of \$131 billion has been inserted. I think it is important to realize what the administration is doing in this context. The Economic Indicators of this month, October, are now out and on page 35, "Federal financing," we can see what the cumulative totals of expenditures for the first 3 months of the fiscal year 1968 are—\$36.7 billion, multiplied by 4 to get the annual expenditure rate of \$146.8 billion.

It seems very apparent to me that the scofflaws are not just those who were around the Pentagon and involved in rioting in the streets.

Apparently, people high in this administration are having difficulty in abiding by the laws.

AIR QUALITY ACT

(Mr. REINECKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules reported out favorably the rule on the bill, S. 780, the Air Quality Act which we will have an opportunity to debate and amend in the House next week.

I support this rule because certainly air quality is something that must be given serious attention and consideration in all parts of our country, and in particular in the Los Angeles area where I come from, where we have a very serious air pollution problem, where we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in an effort to get rid of air pollution in California in the last 20 years.

But now comes an amendment by JOHN DINGELL from Detroit, known as the Dingell amendment, which would specifically deny any State from establishing standards. Only after the State of California begs and pleads with the Secretary if he desires—not mandatory—to allow standards more stringent than the national standard. It is inconceivable to me that this House in its good judgment could deny the right of any State to do what it can for itself, spending its own money to improve the health of its citizens and to improve the liveliness of its surroundings and its communities. What has happened to the Great Society? Are we becoming champions of democracy? What about the little man in the street we were concerned about? Or are we now concerned only about the automobile manufacturer? They are the only ones who can truly benefit from the Dingell amendment.

It must be substituted.

AUTOMOBILES AND AIR POLLUTION IN CALIFORNIA

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] for his remarks relative to the legislation on the Clean Air Act, so called. It is logical that there should be national standards, minimum standards, in relation, say, to drugs, because the effect of drugs is essentially the same on people wherever they are in the country.

But this is a vast country, and the effect of automobile emissions are quite different in some parts of the country than they are in others. In California of necessity there are, with temperature, layer inversions, and so forth, much higher standards required in that regard to protect human life and health than there are in other parts of the country. To deny by Federal legislation the opportunity for a State to protect its people by imposing such standards is to deny it the opportunity to exercise its inherent power to protect its citizens.

Therefore, we hope that this permission will be allotted to California and to

October 25, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 13935

RECENT OUTBREAK OF HOSTILITIES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the most recent outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East is doubly disturbing. Not only does it pose the threat of a resumption of full-scale war but it undermines what efforts have been made in recent weeks to devise some long-range solution to the disputes which have plagued that troubled region for two decades.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Soviet Union, which was the culpable outsider in the May-June outburst, has encouraged and facilitated the renewed Arab aggression. In the wake of the June war, as the world community devoted itself to securing a stable peace in the Middle East, the Soviet Union provided massive arms assistance to the same Arab States which had demonstrated their aggressive intent.

The sinking of the Israel destroyer, *Eilat*, without warning, was calculated to stimulate either retaliation or, at a minimum, an expanded response by Israel to the next United Arab Republic provocation. The exchange of artillery fire in which the Suez oil fields were hit can be judged only in the light of the Soviet-applauded United Arab Republic sinking of the *Eilat*.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that our Government has lifted the embargo on arms shipments to Israel. To have done less in the face of Soviet arms shipments to those Arab States openly committed to Israel's destruction would have left Israel less able to defend herself. The Soviet Union's present attempts to induce the U.N. Security Council to condemn Israel is consistent with its attempts to produce a false impression of who initiated the crisis in the Middle East only 5 months ago. Our Government's opposition to these Soviet efforts in both cases is eminently correct.

The Soviet Union has once again fanned the flames of armed conflict in the Middle East and a too-willing Nasser has responded with violence. Both deserve the condemnation of a world anxious to see a viable peace in this troubled area.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Inter-oceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 24, 1967.)

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

(Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include tables.)

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the bill agreed to in conference is a good bill considering the need to reduce Federal expenditures at this time to a minimum because of the serious fiscal situation facing the country. I regret that I cannot say that it is a good bill for the water resource development of our Nation. In that regard it makes provision for only the most essential requirements, primarily to fund contractors' earnings under going projects.

The bill total is \$4.7 billion of which \$2.5 billion, or 53 percent, is for the atomic energy program. The bill is \$177 million below the budget request. With one exception, every appropriation item in the bill is at or below the budget request. This one exception, involving the appropriation for flood control for the Mississippi River and tributaries, represents an increase required over the budget to restore the program to the 1967 level.

The Senate bill provided an increase of \$153,142,000 over the House bill. The final conference agreement includes \$67,891,000 of this increase, of which \$15,000,000 is for additional requirements for the atomic energy weapons program arising from the decision, made subsequent to House bill passage, to deploy anti-ballistic-missile system. Additional, sizable requirements under this program will have to be absorbed by the Atomic Energy Commission within the funds provided.

Although the bill does provide an increase of \$380,642,000 over fiscal year 1967, \$310,103,000, or 82 percent, is to meet additional requirements of the Atomic Energy Commission. This AEC increase, \$136,967,000 less than requested, is required primarily to finance continuing activities funded last year with carryover unobligated balances and program revenues and to meet increased requirements of the weapons program.

The net increase over 1967 of \$70,539,000 for all the other agencies in the bill includes an increase of \$62,737,000 for the Federal water pollution control program.

Excluding AEC, the bill total is \$2.2 billion. Included in this is \$295.8 million for the Federal water pollution control program which is being carried in this bill for the first time this year. For water pollution control research and development grants and the operating program, the bill makes an 8-percent reduction in the budget estimate. For construction grants for waste treatment works the House conferees have insisted on an allowance of only the budget request of \$203 million as provided in the House bill compared with the authorization of \$450 million. The Senate bill increased

the House and budget figures by \$22 million. We have brought this item back in disagreement and will ask for a separate vote to insist on the House figure.

Another \$259.9 million in the bill is for the annual operation maintenance requirements on completed projects of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and the power agencies. The bill reflects a reduction in the budget request for these items of \$9.5 million. Any significant additional reductions are not possible without neglecting essential maintenance items, resulting in more costly rehabilitation in future years.

The bill also carries \$40.5 million for the operation of the Canal Zone Government of the Panama Canal which is repaid to the U.S. Treasury out of revenue from the operation of the Panama Canal Company. Another \$21.2 million in the bill is to cover the cost of operation and maintenance of the national cemeteries, including Arlington Cemetery.

The balance of \$1.6 billion remaining in the bill is primarily for the activities of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and the power agencies of the Federal Government. Excluding the investigation programs and necessary administrative expenses, \$1.4 billion remains for the going construction programs of these agencies for flood control, water supply, irrigation, and power facilities. Of the \$1.3 billion included in this total for construction by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, only \$24.2 million is to initiate construction on new starts. The balance of the appropriations—98 percent—is to finance the continuation of construction during the current fiscal year of projects previously approved by Congress. Under the Corps of Engineers, for example, about 70 percent of the funds is required to meet obligation commitments on continuing contracts and the remaining 30 percent is to provide for new contracts required to meet construction schedules on going projects. Many of these pending new contracts are essential to avoid project shutdowns and to prevent damage and loss to works already put in place under prior contracts.

The allowance made in the bill for each construction appropriation item already reflects a general, lump sum reduction, averaging over 10 percent, to be applied to the individual amounts programmed for the projects. In turn, the committee has taken full advantage of actual carryover funds available from last fiscal year and has reduced the new appropriation requests accordingly. In total, the allowances for the construction programs of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation reflect lump sum reductions of about \$140 million which will have to be met from carryover funds and through slippages, delays, and stretchout of contract awards, with the resulting reduction in expenditure requirements for fiscal year 1968.

In summary, unless we are ready to cancel present contract commitments on projects now under construction—with the costly consequences now and in the years to come—I feel it is just not pos-

H13936

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 25, 1967

sible to make any additional large-scale savings in appropriations or expenditures beyond those which have already been made in the bill.

Realizing the need to hold down capital expenditures at this time, the bill makes provision for only 34 new construction starts under the Corps of Engineers' program involving a total cost of \$177.8 million to be funded over the next 3 or 4 fiscal years. As completion is scheduled this year on 51 projects which have been financed annually over several years at a total cost of \$735.5 million, there will be a sharp reduction of \$557.7 million in the level of the construction pipeline of the Corps of Engineers.

In order to limit new starts wherever possible to projects involving a low total cost, the committee disallowed construction funds for four—with a total cost of \$130.3 million—of the nine budgeted items, with approval being granted at this time only for additional planning and the initiation of land acquisition. The net total cost, therefore, of the 34 new starts is only \$24.9 million more than the cost of the new starts proposed in the budget. The average total cost of the new starts is only \$5,200,000, 19 of which have a total cost of less than \$3,000,000. The very limited number and low total cost of the new starts in the 1968 bill is in sharp contrast to the appropriation bills over the past 5 years which have averaged about 60 new starts

annually with an average total cost of about \$1 billion.

Because it reflects both the defense expenditures required under the atomic energy program as well as the funds for water resource development, as I said when we had this bill on the floor back in July, perhaps this appropriation bill best demonstrates that we cannot afford to fight a war with its tremendous expenditures and at the same time make provision for even the most essential current requirements for the development of our own Nation. It means that we will have to pay a large price in the future and I hope it will not be too late. The large annual losses due to flood damages, the critical water and power supply situation facing many areas, and the increasing problems arising from water pollution are known to all of us. Unless it is possible at an early date to make provision within the national budget for the funding of the most essential projects to help alleviate these conditions, the Nation will be faced with a most serious situation necessitating a most costly and inefficient crash program.

Finally, we have brought back in disagreement the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam and Reservoir project in Maine. As you know, funds to continue and complete planning on the project were deleted by floor amendment here in the House. The Senate restored the full budget request of \$1,676,000 to complete the planning. The House conferees have

insisted that the item must be brought back for a separate vote in order that the House may again have an opportunity to work its will. At the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment allowing only \$875,000 to permit the Corps to continue with a minimum program of exploration work and preliminary design on the dam and spillway and the diversion tunnel, at a cost of \$480,000. The balance of the amount, \$395,000, is required to complete outstanding commitments on site surveys and explorations and to pay outstanding bills in connection with the project. This allowance would provide us with valuable additional information to verify cost estimates for further review. There would still be a balance of about \$800,000 required to actually complete the planning in future fiscal years. As you know, our committee recommended the budget request of the \$1,676,000 to continue planning on the project as our extensive committee staff investigation confirmed that the project is economically feasible, with a benefit-to-cost ratio 1.9 to 1, and would provide efficient hydroelectric power at reasonable rates for peaking purposes as well as firm power to preference customers in Maine. I therefore have personally supported the project and recommended that you approve the allowance of \$875,000 to continue planning when it is brought up for a separate vote.

SUMMARY TABLE—PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

Item	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimate, 1968 (as amended)	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL									
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY									
Cemeterial Expenses									
Salaries and expenses.....	\$17,148,000	\$24,637,000	\$21,200,000	\$21,200,000	\$21,200,000	+\$4,052,000	-\$3,437,000		
Corps of Engineers—Civil									
General Investigations.....	32,450,000	39,745,000	33,745,000	36,246,000	34,445,000	+1,995,000	-5,300,000	+\$700,000	-\$1,801,000
Construction, general.....	967,460,000	\$972,992,000	935,074,000	1,010,823,000	968,474,000	+1,014,000	-4,518,000	+33,400,000	-42,349,000
Operation and maintenance, general.....	179,000,000	197,634,000	189,000,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	+11,000,000	-7,634,000	+1,000,000	
Flood control and coastal emergencies.....	7,000,000					-7,000,000			
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.....	87,135,000	77,400,000	83,400,000	91,480,000	87,135,000		+9,735,000	+3,735,000	-4,345,000
General expenses.....	\$18,014,000	19,914,000	18,950,000	18,950,000	18,950,000	+936,000	-964,000		
Total, Corps of Engineers—Civil.....	1,291,059,000	1,307,685,000	1,260,169,000	1,347,499,000	1,299,704,000	+7,945,000	-8,681,000	+38,835,000	-48,495,000
The Panama Canal									
Canal Zone Government:									
Operating expenses.....	\$34,746,000	36,191,000	36,000,000	36,000,000	36,000,000	+1,254,000	-191,000		
Capital outlay.....	2,000,000	5,024,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	+2,500,000	-524,000		
Panama Canal Company: Limitation on general and administrative expenses.....	\$(12,278,000)	(13,267,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(+722,000)	(-267,000)		
Total the Panama Canal.....	36,746,000	41,215,000	40,500,000	40,500,000	40,500,000	+3,754,000	-715,000		
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil.....	1,344,953,000	1,373,537,000	1,321,869,000	1,409,199,000	1,360,704,000	+15,751,000	-12,833,000	+38,835,000	-48,495,000
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR									
Bureau of Reclamation									
General investigations.....	15,075,000	16,523,000	16,000,000	21,555,000	16,523,000	+1,448,000		+523,000	-5,032,000
Construction and rehabilitation.....	\$192,825,000	\$181,868,000	172,700,000	185,005,000	181,868,000	-10,957,000		+9,168,000	-3,137,000
Operation and maintenance.....	\$42,350,000	49,540,000	48,300,000	48,300,000	48,300,000	+5,950,000	-1,240,000		
Loan program.....	12,995,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,400,000	15,000,000	+2,005,000			-400,000
Upper Colorado River storage project.....	50,198,000	\$41,260,000	41,000,000	41,000,000	41,000,000	-9,198,000	-260,000		
Emergency fund.....	1,000,000					-1,000,000			
General administrative expenses.....	\$11,567,000	11,356,000	11,356,000	1,356,000	11,356,000	-211,000			
Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....	326,010,000	315,547,000	304,356,000	322,616,000	314,047,000	-11,963,000	-1,500,000	+9,691,000	-8,569,000

Footnotes at end of table.

October 25, 1967

Approved For Release 2001/11/01 : CIA-RDP69B00369R000200290080-5

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 13983

Spellman, Rev. Daniel Poling, Cardinal Cushing, Rev. Frank W. Lowry, Hon. FRANCES BOLTON, Prof. Frank N. Trager; Gen. Thomas S. Power, U.S. Air Force, retired; Prof. Stefan T. Possony, Hon. Spruille Braden, Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, U.S. Army, retired; Elliott Macrae, Hon. Charles Edison, Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, Prof. Anthony T. Bouscaren, Igor Sikorsky, Allan B. Kline, Patrick J. Frawley, and William L. White. As of October 18, more than 100 signatures have already been received from other American leaders.

To attempt to foresee what the future holds in store for us, it is necessary to review the past. Realizing that the past is prologue, the proclamation, "Day of Mourning for the Victims of Communism," seeks to remember the victims of the world's greatest aggression while calling on us to rededicate ourselves to restoring freedom to communism's captives. Only then will we be assured of peace and freedom in the next 50 years.

I place the proclamation, along with the news release of the Citizens for Freedom and its recommendations for action, in the Record at this point:

PROCLAMATION: DAY OF MOURNING FOR THE VICTIMS OF COMMUNISM

November 7th will mark the 50th anniversary of one of the greatest disasters in history—the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia. From that country the communist blight has spread until it torments a billion human beings.

We free Americans record:

—That during the last half-century, communism has been responsible for the extermination of at least 85 million people through civil war, man-made famine, purges, genocidal deportations and executions, in torture chambers and in concentration camps;

That communism has systematically destroyed moral and spiritual values; imposed incalculable sufferings on nations and people; has persecuted all religions and placed myriad minds in the chains of thought control;

That communism set the pattern for Fascism, Nazism and other varieties of totalitarianism, and that its relentless drive for world domination has kept nearly a hundred million people of East-Central Europe in bondage and the world in a state of turmoil;

That since 1917 not one of the nation's conquered by force or seized by subterfuge has been permitted a free election, nor has any free people ever voted to adopt communism in preference to democracy;

That during these 50 years, communist dictatorships have preached "liberation" while practicing unlimited oppression to consolidate their rule based on terror;

Therefore, believing it to be the solemn duty of those who cherish freedom and conscience to speak for the silenced and to honor the martyred dead,

We, free American individuals and organizations, do proclaim November 7th a Day of Mourning for the Victims of Communism;

We call on free men everywhere to observe that day and that week by commemorations and prayers; and

We call on every community to rededicate itself in its own way to restoring the freedoms already destroyed for a billion human beings and threatened by communism for the rest of mankind.

CITIZEN GROUPS PROCLAIM NOVEMBER 7 "A DAY OF MOURNING FOR THE VICTIMS OF COMMUNISM"

NEW YORK, N.Y., October 18, 1967.—The Soviets have organized world-wide celebrations for November 7th, to mark the 50th anniversary

of the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia.

To counter these celebrations of communist power, November 7th has been proclaimed a "Day of Mourning for the Victims of Communism" by a group of prominent Americans and over 60 organizations in the United States—patriotic, civic, veterans, ethnic, captive nations and religious.

Announcement of the Day of Mourning was made by a Coordinating Committee in behalf of the participating groups, many of whom represent world-wide opposition to international communism from Cuba to China, and in behalf of well-known Americans supporting the action. They described the effort as a spontaneous voluntary response to the wish of many organizations and individuals, hitherto unassociated, to counter together the massive Soviet celebration which has been in preparation for over two years.

The formal Proclamation, made public today, calls upon communities throughout the country to observe the week of November 7th with memorial ceremonies, religious services and in other ways to "remember the heroic dead" and indict the crimes of communism.

Acting on American initiative, the Day of Mourning was also proclaimed by a resolution adopted on September 28th by the World Anti-Communist League and the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League, at their joint conference, just concluded in Taipei, Taiwan. The Conference represented organizations from 72 nations plus 15 international organizations. The American delegation was headed by former Congressman Dr. Walter H. Judd.

Members of the Coordinating Committee set up to assist the effort include Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Hal Lehrman, John M. Fisher, Dr. William E. Kintner, Father Daniel Lyons, Rev. David Head, Colonel James W. Gerard, Eugene Lyons and Lady Malcolm Douglas-Hamilton. The Committee's address is given as Box 556, Lenox Hill Station, New York City 10021, to which suggestions and endorsements can be mailed.

Among the first prominent Americans to sign the Proclamation are: Cardinal Spellman; Rev. Daniel Poling; Cardinal Cushing; Rev. Frank W. Lowry; Hon. Frances Bolton; Prof. Frank N. Trager; Gen. Thomas S. Power (USAF Ret); Prof. Stefan T. Possony; Hon. Spruille Braden; Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer (USA Ret); Elliott Macrae; Hon. Charles Edison; Dr. Kenneth D. Wells; Prof. Anthony T. Bouscaren; Igor Sikorsky; Allan B. Kline; Patrick J. Frawley and William L. White. More than 100 signatures have already been received from other American leaders.

Anti-Communist groups in other free countries have been appraised of the American action and already, according to the Committee, it is clear that the Day of Mourning will be observed in many parts of the non-communist world.

"During this half-century" the Proclamation declared, "communism has been responsible for the extermination of at least 85-million people; has systematically destroyed moral, intellectual and spiritual values; persecuted all religions; set the pattern for Fascism and Nazism; has preached 'liberation' while practicing unlimited oppression."

The undertaking was prompted by the need to "counter-act the anniversary barrage of propaganda for communism now inundating the world". The Committee expressed appreciation for the tremendous initial support from all quarters and suggests that churches, synagogues, civic and fraternal groups and communities throughout the U.S. arrange solemn memorial events.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION—"DAY OF MOURNING FOR THE VICTIMS OF COMMUNISM"

What can you do, directly and through your organizations, to make the "Day of Mourning" an effective condemnation of communist crimes and a rededication to principles of political and spiritual freedom? We offer what follows simply as suggestions for your interest and guidance. You will, we are con-

fident, think of other ways to call attention to the Proclamation and initiate public action in its spirit.

1. Arrange a religious service in your church or synagogue. Contact local ministers, priests, rectors, rabbis, asking them to set and announce a special service of prayer as a memorial to the tens of millions of men, women and children who have lost their lives since 1917 as a direct result of the oppressions and aggressions of international communism. Sunday, November 5th, is an appropriate date, but the following Sunday, or any day in the anniversary period, would do as well.

2. Contact the City Editor of your local newspapers and other publications, urging them to publish the enclosed press release and especially the full text of the Proclamation.

3. Ask your local radio and TV stations to put on programs built around the news release and the Proclamation. The programs should emphasize the 90 million dead as a result of communism, and the billion human beings now under the communist yoke. Local citizens well informed on the evils of communism could be invited to speak, singly or in panels, on the all-important issue.

4. Summon special meetings of your clubs, organization chapters, etc. to mark the "Day of Mourning" with appropriate speeches, resolutions and publicity.

5. Utilize any and all other channels and devices to publicize the Proclamation and encourage its observance. If possible, have it run as an advertisement in the local papers, as it stands or signed by prominent citizens in your area. (Some publisher, we feel sure, will cooperate by giving the space gratis.) Have the Proclamation read on radio and television stations, either by their own commentators or by an invited guest known to their audience.

6. Write letters to the editor based on the facts in the Proclamation; the importance, as a matter of conscience, of memorializing the victims; the necessity to counteract pro-Soviet propaganda. In particular, do not allow such propaganda in the press and on the air to go unchallenged.

7. If you or your family or organization are related in any way with a country behind the Iron Curtain, including Russia itself, wear a black arm-band on your sleeve on November 7th, in solemn remembrance of the victims of communism.

8. Local groups in many parts of the country are organizing patriotic parades in October in honor and support of our boys fighting in Vietnam, sponsored by the Committee for Responsible Patriotism or in connection with Veterans Day sponsored by The American Legion or Veterans of Foreign Wars. Cooperate with these efforts, and make sure that placards play up the "Day of Mourning for the Victims of Communism".

9. Arrange a Prayer-Breakfast—held at a club, fraternal house, home or hotel—to mark the "Day of Mourning". The presence of a sympathetic clergyman to conduct the prayers would, of course, be essential.

10. Arrange for as many flags as possible in your area to fly at half-mast on November 7th. If your local Mayor will proclaim November 7th as a "Day of Mourning"—and he probably will if properly alerted—then flags on official buildings would be at half-mast. In any case, as many individuals as possible should be persuaded to lower their flags in deference to the millions of innocent victims.

11. A fateful struggle is now under way between a large portion of the Soviet intelligentsia and the totalitarian regime. Especially young people, students and writers, are defying the censors and the thought police, at the risk of arrest, incarceration and confinement in lunatic asylums. At your "Day of Mourning" meetings and prayers, and in your resolutions, express your sympathy for these freedom fighters and condemn the regime for persecuting them.

12. Write to your Senator, Congressman and other public officials, urging them to take

Approved For Release 2001/11/01 : CIA-RDP69B00369R000200290080-5

October 25, 1967

H13984

cognizance of the "Day of Mourning for the Victims of Communism" by speaking on the floor of their Legislature, introducing resolutions in the spirit of this Proclamation, or in any other way they may choose to assert their compassion for those sacrificed on the altars of communism.

13. November 7th is Election Day in most of the country. This should not be considered a deterrent to observance of the "Day of Mourning"; on the contrary, it means that many people will not be working and can participate in activities.

ISRAEL DEFENSE

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I strongly recommend that the U.S. policy in the Mideast protect our friend and democratic nation of Israel.

We in Congress must face realities and facts in the Mideast, and must make sure the threats of genocide of the whole Israel people cannot be carried out by the Arab nations or by their leaders, nor by any nation or group of nations. Israel has every right to exist, and live in peace with her neighbors, and contribute to the progress and stability of the whole Mideast.

In previous wars in the Mideast, and threats of war, I have urged the U.S. State Department to actively aid in Israel's defense through supply of defensive weapons, to lessen the chance and possible success of attack.

Let us take the sinking of the Israel destroyer as a tragic mistake of policy by Egypt, that will surely cause further loss to Egypt, her people, and her economy, through reprisals. These incendiary acts can lead to escalation, and according to the authority of Clausen, can inevitably swing back and forth, in a succession of incidents, resulting in general and tragic war.

I strongly recommend that the U.S. Congress pass a resolution under sponsorship of the House Armed Services Committee giving to Israel at once, a late series destroyer to replace the Israel destroyer *Elath* that has been sunk by Egypt through missile attack. Israel has the *Elath* crew to man the destroyer which the United States promptly should make available, wherever in the Mediterranean such a U.S. destroyer is deployed. The Israel *Elath* crew should be immediately flown by aircraft to such U.S. destroyer.

I firmly believe the United States must live up to its commitments to Israel to deliver 48 Skyhawk planes. This should be done now.

It is especially necessary that Israel be treated fairly for Israeli defense, as the U.S. Johnson administration has just given notice of the resumption of delivery of arms to Arab States in the Mideast. These Arab leaders still openly state that Israel and the Israel people must be destroyed.

What a tragedy, what a travesty of

justice, and a disregard of the basic human right even to exist, if the destruction of Israel and the slaughter of the Israel people is accomplished with United States and U.S.S.R.-supplied weapons.

I have for years favored a Marshall-type plan for all the nations of the Mideast to bring progress, security, and peace to this vital strategic area, so that all peoples can rise and in democracy look forward to a happy, rewarding, and secure tomorrow. Wars, death, and destruction are a poor substitute for such a United States, European, and world policy.

ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT CONTINUES VITAL ROLE OF PROTECTING SMALL BUSINESSMEN

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our time has seen the adaptation of great scientific achievement to the mass production of a variety of products. Improved materials—plastics; improved production techniques—automation; improved marketing and transportation services—television and air transport are a few among the many that have each contributed to the great prosperity our society now enjoys. Such scientific achievement, however commendable and desirable, must not be used as the excuse for destroying enduring social, economic, and political values which form the bedrock of this country's greatness.

While economic gain is certainly the legitimate goal of corporate management, its thrust must be tempered by the demands of the public good. Increased corporate efficiency and economies of scale are not acceptable substitutes for political and economic freedom in this country. Ever increasing economic concentration poses such a threat to these freedoms. Nevertheless, the attempt is being made to justify such dangerous concentration in terms of economic efficiency. The road to totalitarianism is paved with such excuses.

Our antitrust laws, uniquely fashioned to our experience, serve to preserve our proven ways. It has been established time and again that competition, not monopoly, in the marketplace produces the greatest efficiencies and economies. For over 30 years the Robinson-Patman Act has protected the small businessman from possible discrimination by his giant competitors. Its success may be measured by the extensive criticism leveled against it by those whose predatory impulses it curbs.

A recent article in the trade magazine *Sales Management* posed the question, "Is the Robinson-Patman Act Obsolete?" The editors of the magazine were gracious in printing my answer to the question in their issue of September 20, 1967. I insert my response to this vital question at this point in the Record for the information of my colleagues:

SALES MANAGEMENT'S SEPTEMBER 1 ISSUE ASKED: "IS ROBINSON-PATMAN OBSOLETE?"

(NOTE.—The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN (D-Texas), a co-sponsor of the original 1936 law, here challenges some of the views expressed in our article and offers some constructive comment of his own, for which we thank him.)

Having suffered the slings and arrows of criticism about the Robinson-Patman Act for so many years, I have developed a certain thickness of skin and perhaps a degree of immunity. Indeed, I usually refrain from commenting about the words of my critics, and this course of action has, through the years, been rewarding. For, despite a high chorus of criticism which flows in a continuous stream from certain quarters, the Robinson-Patman Act continues to have many friends and supporters, and the Supreme Court, the ultimate authority, upholds the Act in the most crucial cases.

I first was reluctant to comment on "Is Robinson-Patman Obsolete?" for three reasons: (1) In general, the article itself seems quite fair in discussing recent cases; (2) the administration of the Robinson-Patman Act seems to be in good hands; and (3) recent decisions indicate that the Act is achieving its basic purposes.

In reading through the article I felt that no comment is needed from me except for two things, the title of the article, "Is Robinson-Patman Obsolete?," and the concluding paragraph, which seems to welcome a so-called "mounting chorus . . . urging that the Robinson-Patman Act be reviewed and updated."

ROBINSON-PATMAN IS NEITHER OBSOLETE NOR IN NEED OF REVISION

Long years of experience as a member of Congress have taught me that if any bills you have initiated either pass without enormous criticism and foreboding of disaster to follow or after becoming law remain uncriticized, something was basically wrong with the legislation itself or its enforcement. By this standard, Robinson-Patman must be a pretty good piece of legislation. It is recognized, of course, that one of the principal purposes of an article such as the one we are discussing, in a magazine such as *Sales Management*, is that sales managers, particularly of large industrial multi-market/multi-product firms, want to plan their activities and programs in the light of the court decisions. Certainly these managers of substantial corporations have good legal advice and need no guidance from me. Indeed, I question whether they would accept any "advice" from me, even if offered.

On the other hand, a very brief review of a few of the basic objectives of the Robinson-Patman Act, as we who worked for its passage view it, may provide some of your readers with a certain perspective.

BASIC OBJECTIVE OF ROBINSON-PATMAN WAS TO PROVIDE EFFICIENT SMALL- AND MEDIUM-SIZE FIRMS WITH FAIR OPPORTUNITIES TO COMPETE IN THE MARKETPLACE

At the outset, let me admit to a certain basic sympathy for the local businessman who is trying to compete against the large national corporations. The local businessman provides the seed corn for expansion at home. The national corporation, remotely controlled from some faraway financial center, inevitably siphons off the cream from the local community. All my life it has been my endeavor to do what I could to promote and preserve local values and opportunities for the local businessman to survive and prosper. Despite all the so-called progress claimed by the corporate giants of today, I still believe that the unfair elimination of locally owned businesses seriously cripples our society.

October 25, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H14011

is no reason for this. There is no justification for this. That silver should be made available to the public rather than being held for disappearing coins.

I call upon the Treasury once more to stop minting silver half dollars.

NE file THE GRAVE NEW SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to the grave new situation that has developed in the Middle East as a result of the sinking of an Israeli destroyer by a Soviet-manufactured missile. Thousands of Soviet military technicians and advisors are now in Egypt. This fact is known to U.S. intelligence agencies and to the administration. The administration's refusal to point a finger at the guilty party in the sinking of the destroyer merely invites an intensification of Soviet-Arab collaboration to Israel's great danger.

I do not see how the State Department could ignore the fact that Egypt was responsible for the treacherous attack on the ship and that Russia was also directly or indirectly involved.

When the State Department stated it could not find fault with Egypt in the sinking of the destroyer, it indicated a tendency to avoid facing the grim fact that escalation has occurred in the Middle East conflict. This evasion by our policymakers will only tempt the Russians to send more men and weapons into the Arab States. It will only contribute to the refusal of the Arabs to go to the peace conference table.

I cannot understand how the administration can afford not to take a stand on the side of Israel and, doing so, to denounce the cowardly sinking of the destroyer. This is the same administration that demanded and got a Gulf of Tonkin resolution in 1964 when the Communists merely made hostile gestures at U.S. destroyers but did not sink a single one.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD COMMUNITY

(Mr. ALBERT (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in President Johnson's eloquent and moving remarks to the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical, and Technical Employees meeting here in Washington, one theme was recurrent: "The world remains man's first community." And the United States has an obligation to that community.

This is true when it comes to economic development and expanded international trade.

It is true when discussing military security in Vietnam or in any other place in the world where freedom is threatened.

The President stressed our commitments to international security when he said:

In every way we can, we search for peace in Vietnam. Those who began the war are not willing to explore ways to end it. They cling stubbornly to the belief that their aggression will be rewarded—by our frustration, our impatience, our unwillingness to stay the course. It will not be so.

The President talked about an emerging regionalism in world trade, aid, education, mutual security—and we are indeed part of that growing regionalism.

Today, as we speak about global challenges, we are in the habit of reading only about America's contributions to other nations; of America's military assistance; of America's trade with other nations.

Yet, the world community is a two-way street. Without other nations, the United States would stand alone. Without trading countries to purchase America's products, we might not enjoy the level of prosperity we have today.

And if we want to go back to our earlier history, we might never have had a successful American revolution without the aid and support of other nations.

Therefore, the strong American relationship to the world must be kept inviolate.

We must stand for what we believe and protect the American economy. At the same time we must work in every forum toward a true community of nations where war is no longer an instrument of foreign policy, and where men and nations trade freely and peacefully across the boundaries only of space and time.

I insert in the RECORD the remarks of President Johnson before the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical, and Technical Employees on October 23:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF COMMERCIAL, CLERICAL, AND TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES

It is a great pleasure for me to welcome you here for your first conference in this hemisphere.

I have been familiar for many years with your work.

In 1961, I took one of the most rewarding and exciting trips of my life with your President—Jim Suffridge. We visited a number of your countries together, on a mission for President Kennedy. It was on that journey—with Mr. Suffridge as my guide—that I saw some of the worldwide activities of FIET.

I saw then in other lands what I knew well in my own—working people building better lives for themselves and better futures for their families through their labor organizations. I saw schools, new housing and health clinics, credit unions and cooperatives which had been created largely with the help of their trade unions.

As you meet to study the problems and the promise of tomorrow, I join you as one who shares your vision of the good life. I come as a representative of 200 million people who want very much to see a world in which the guns of war are stilled; in which every nation is free to mark its own course; in which every man is able to build—through his own effort—fulfillment for himself and opportunity for his children.

We can agree quickly that this is the goal we all seek—because we are not the first to put it into words. In this generation, many men from many lands have talked hopefully of a stable world of growing promise—because for the first time in man's history it is realistic to think in global terms about improving man's condition.

The fact that mankind now can rid this

planet of ignorance and hunger is one of the most awesome bits of knowledge we live with.

It is History's cruel paradox that man should finally acquire this ability, after all his years of struggle, just as he also gains the power to destroy his race.

The rest of his story will be told—if it is told at all—in terms of which power he employs.

He can use his atomic might to make the deserts of the world bloom—or to incinerate his planet.

We can use our science to develop weapons that dwarf the mind—or to expand men's minds with learning.

We can commit our sons to a new generation of peril—or leave them the foundations stones for a new civilization.

The will to live is the strongest human impulse. It generates a stubborn optimism which runs deep in the human spirit.

An eloquent American writer has given it voice in our time. "I believe," he said, "that man will not merely endure; he will prevail. He is immortal, not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice, but because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance."

William Faulkner spoke those words almost two decades ago. It is a measure of how far we have come that they sounded braver then than they do now.

The great victories of reason and agreement, which can assure the survival of the human race, still lie ahead of us.

The ones behind us are modest and small. But they are victories nonetheless.

We have not yet passed safely through the danger we have created. But we have walked far enough to dare to hope that we will make it.

The fact that war itself has not yet disappeared is a matter of infinite tragedy.

Many thousands of our countrymen are today involved in a bitter conflict in a land far from here—because armed invaders try to impose their will on their neighbor.

In every way we can, we search for peace in Vietnam. But we appear to be searching alone. Those who began the war are not willing to explore ways to end it. They cling stubbornly to the belief that their aggression will be rewarded—by our frustration, our impatience, our unwillingness to stay the course.

It will not be so.

Peace and stability will come to Asia only when the aggressors know that they cannot take another people's land by force.

Our Asian allies fighting beside us believe this.

And so do the leaders and the people of those free nations in the path of conquest. But to end the threat of war, we must do even more than keep aggression in check.

Most wars are bred in conditions of human misery. Aggressors are boldest when they can exploit a people's discontent.

This discontent churns in a world where illiteracy cripples two-fifths of the adult population—and where disease still dooms children to an early death.

The experience of the last decade proves that violence erupts most often in nations which are poor.

The great work of our day, then, is to change the conditions that encourage war—to do something about the old tyrannies of hunger and disease and ignorance, which still enslave two-thirds of the human race.

That work has well started.

I am proud of the role my own Nation has played in the beginning of this worthy adventure. A leading public figure of a free Asian country recently said about the United States: "... This is perhaps the first time in history that a world power has consciously used its strength and wealth to promote the interests of weak and poor nations."

H14012

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 25, 1967

On behalf of our people, I believe that tribute is well-deserved. The American people have used their resources in a constructive and compassionate way—because we have had to learn quickly the lessons which history forced upon us overnight.

Today, history teaches us all a new lesson.

A concept of world order is quietly emerging which offers the world its best chance for constructive change.

It is a new sense of community. It links together states that share a common geography.

There is no word which can adequately describe it and convey the excitement and hope it generates. But for want of a better term, we refer to it as regionalism.

It is built on an awareness which has grown rapidly in the minds of many men. That idea is simply this—despite the passions of nationalism, the problems of an area respect no national borders. There is a belief that action can be more effective when it is taken in unison. There is a determination to work together in shaping a common destiny; through economic development.

The logic of this idea first became evident in Europe. The chaos of war forced the leaders of Western Europe to look with new insight into the old patterns of rivalry. They reached a significant conclusion. They saw that the more they could travel together, the faster they could move to a prosperous future. Going it alone, they might never make it. The European Common Market was a result of this thinking.

In Latin America, economic integration is clearly seen as the key which can unlock strength dreamed of for centuries.

In Asia the same idea has now begun—for the very first time—to persuade separate nations of their common purpose.

Africa, too, is feeling the stirrings of a regional spirit.

Only in the Middle East do ancient rivalries and frustrations still seem to inhibit the prospects of cooperation. But in our search for new solutions to old challenges, there is hope even here that men will look together at the problems they share.

Nowhere is the road easy, and nowhere has that road yet been fully travelled. But men and nations are moving ahead.

In my years of public life, no development in world affairs has encouraged me more. Behind the headlines of crisis, a new spirit of progress has been quietly at work.

The United States will continue to encourage its development and to support its growth.

But the world itself remains man's first community. And problems still must be met on a global basis—weather control, for example, and the spread of nuclear weapons, and international monetary reform.

World trade is yet another.

Just five years ago, the major trading countries began the most ambitious round of trade negotiations ever undertaken. Because these talks were initiated by a great American President, they took his name, and became known as the Kennedy Round.

This past summer, the Kennedy Round was successfully concluded. It brought tariff reductions greater than any in history. It moved the world closer to the healthy trading conditions on which the prosperity of many nations depends.

It was an historic landmark in the efforts of all of us to create a sounder world community.

Preserving the gains won in the Kennedy Round is essential to the world's harmony and well-being.

It will not be easy. Freer trade often causes temporary but painful dislocations. And today, once again, we hear protectionist voices rising out of the past.

But larger interests must prevail. We must consider our common interests in protecting

our consumers; in promoting healthy and competitive industry and agriculture; in raising the productivity and wages of our workers.

We have an enormous stake in keeping and extending the benefits of 30 years of constructive trade policy.

And our overall interest lies in working together to establish new conditions for a peaceful and more prosperous world order.

To the developing countries, striving to reach the 20th Century industrial world, trade is the lifeline of hope.

The leading nations of the Free World are together studying ways to improve the trading position of those emerging lands. In the meantime, the Kennedy Round increases the trading opportunities they so badly need.

That increase in strength is not enough to assure their industrial success. But it is a step forward.

The world is moving fast. Developments measured a step at a time may not stir the mind as forcefully as the headlong rush of crisis can.

And through a generation of peril, progress has often moved forward by short steps. Yet those steps now add up to many miles.

It is good for us all, I think, when we are burdened by the awareness of how far we must still go, to look back and reflect on how far we have come.

Thank you.

PROMINENT AMERICANS STRONGLY SUPPORT PRESIDENT'S INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

(Mr. ALBERT (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, an independent committee of distinguished Americans—including former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower—has done a great service for its country by strongly supporting American policy in Vietnam.

In their historic first policy statement, these Americans joined in voice to tell the world that “we strongly support our commitment in Vietnam and the policy of noncompromising, although limited resistance to aggression.”

Like President Johnson, these prominent Americans—who include two former Presidents, two former Secretaries of State, a former Secretary of Defense, General of the Army Omar Bradley, and former Senator Paul Douglas—recognize the need to stop Communist aggression in Vietnam before its fires spread to the entire Asian mainland.

And, like the President, these concerned Americans recognize the need to temper our nuclear might—to “follow a sensible road between capitulation and the indiscriminate use of raw power.”

For far too long, a small vocal minority of Americans have captured headlines with strident dissent. For too many months, the voices of dissent have received attention far out of proportion to their numbers, their influence, and the feasibility of their empty alternatives.

This committee will speak for the vast majority of Americans who support America's efforts to stop the forward thrust of militant Asian communism.

They will assure that Hanoi and Peking hear—loud and clear—the true voice of America.

A voice filled with pride at the job being done in Vietnam and the men doing it.

A voice unswerving in its conviction to see this conflict through to an honorable solution for all sides.

The distinguished citizens who have of their own initiative spoken out today, speak with the assurance of long years of experience in foreign affairs.

It is their considered and knowledgeable judgment that American involvement in Vietnam is vital to the future of Southeast Asia and to the free world.

I agree wholeheartedly.

So do millions of Americans, who refuse to allow the outnumbered voices of dissent to stampede the truth.

Under the unanimous consent agreement, I insert at this point the full text of a press release issued today by the Citizens Committee for Peace with Freedom in Vietnam, as well as the text of a policy statement issued by the committee, remarks of Hon. Paul H. Douglas, organizing chairman of the committee, at a news conference this morning, and a membership roster of the committee:

[Press release of Citizens Committee for Peace With Freedom in Vietnam, Oct. 25, 1967]

PEACE WITH FREEDOM GROUP TO SPEAK FOR “SILENT CENTER”

The formation of the Citizens Committee for Peace with Freedom in Vietnam was announced in Washington, D.C. at a press conference coordinated by Former Senator Paul H. Douglas, Organizing Chairman, General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, Co-chairman, and Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, Vice Chairman. The Committee's initial policy statement is attached as well as a membership roster of the committee.

The 107-member Committee includes all four living men who have occupied the offices of President of the United States or Secretary of State.

Among the Founding Members of the Committee, in addition to former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower and former Secretaries of State Byrnes and Acheson, former Senator Douglas, General Bradley and Mrs. Lord are: George Meany (Co-chairman), Archbishop Lucey (Co-chairman), Former Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Dr. James B. Conant, Benjamin F. Swig, General Lucius D. Clay, Nobel Laureates E. L. Tatum, Harold C. Urey and Eugene Wigner, and 31 distinguished intellectuals almost all from university faculties, including 19 recognized authorities on Asian affairs, history and political science.

The Committee has excluded from membership all elected and appointed Federal officials, including all Senators and Congressmen; Governors, publishers and foundation heads.

The Committee is bi-partisan and is incorporated in the District of Columbia as a non-profit organization.

Charles Tyroler 2nd, Committee Vice-Chairman, Research, will be Director of Staff Operations. Abbott Washburn, Committee Secretary, will be Deputy Director. Huntington Harris is Treasurer.

PEACE WITH FREEDOM

(A policy statement of the Citizens Committee for Peace With Freedom in Vietnam, unanimously adopted by the founding members)

We are a group of concerned citizens who seek peace with freedom in Vietnam.

We do so in the conviction that our own vital national interests are at stake in that

October 25, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

curbs on mail order sales of handguns only. Rifles or shotguns would not be affected.

Under this bill, sponsored by Sen. Roman L. Hruska (R-Neb.), prospective handgun buyers would have to submit affidavits attesting to good moral character and background.

Hruska, chief ally of the National Rifle Assn. in the fight against outlawing interstate gun sales, said he will ask the Senate Judiciary Committee to substitute his bill for the Administration measure.

Hruska succeeded in such a maneuver last year. With the 16-man Judiciary Committee evenly split over the Administration bill, backers of the President's legislation reluctantly voted for the Hruska measure in hopes they could strengthen it on the Senate floor. But Congress adjourned before the Senate could act.

Leading backers of the Administration bill, such as Sens. Thomas J. Dodd (D-Conn.) and Edward M. (Ted) Kennedy (D-Mass.), concede they may have to do the same thing this year if the Judiciary Committee deadlocks. But Kennedy said his preferred course in the event of a deadlock is to try to attach the Johnson bill as an amendment to some other legislation that has a better chance of passage.

Another hope is to induce one or both of two committee Democrats who have opposed the Administration bill, Sens. Philip A. Hart (Mich.) and Quentin N. Burdick (N.D.) to change their position.

Hart and Burdick are liberals who usually support Administration domestic programs. But coming from states where hunting and shooting interests exert much influence, both have balked at curbing sales of rifles and shotguns.

It is largely because of Hruska that the Republicans have been so closely identified with the opposition to the Administration's bill. Hruska is a power in the Senate GOP establishment. He also is second-ranking Republican (just behind Illinois' Sen. Everett M. Dirksen) on the Judiciary Committee and is ranking Republican on the Judiciary subcommittee that approved the Administration gun bill by a 5-4 vote last week.

OPPOSITION VIEW

Asked why he is opposed to applying the gun sale curbs in his bill to rifles and shotguns, Hruska said:

"Because it would impose a lot of hardship and red tape on sportsmen." He also said such weapons are not a major factor in crimes involving guns.

This position is an argument that President Johnson already has shown skill in handling.

Clearly alluding in part to snipers in recent ghetto riots, the President said his bill "is aimed solely at keeping deadly weapons out of the wrong hands" and that it would "impose no real inconvenience" on sportsmen and legitimate gun buyers.

"But under any circumstances," Mr. Johnson added, "who would measure inconvenience against the personal safety and security of thousands of American citizens?"

DIRKSEN CHANGES

One Republican who seemed to sense the political pitfalls posed by the President's words was Dirksen. Until recently Dirksen has been opposed to any gun legislation stronger than the Hruska bill. But last week Dirksen said if the Hruska substitute effort fails he might be disposed to vote for the Administration bill.

Yet even if the Senate passes the Administration bill, its prospects of getting through the House are not regarded as good.

Reps. Emanuel Celler (D-N.Y.), chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and James C. Corman (D-Calif.), his chief lieutenant on gun control, predicted tough sledding.

"We've got to have strong bipartisan agreement to get any kind of bill out of committee and then get it through the House," Corman said. "And the Republicans don't seem to want anything stronger than the Hruska bill."

PREDICTS DEFEAT

This was confirmed by Rep. Richard H. Poff (R-Va.), second-ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee.

"Anything stronger than the Hruska bill doesn't have a prayer in the House," Poff said in an interview. "And some of our people think even the Hruska bill goes too far."

If Poff's prediction comes true, observers suggest, Mr. Johnson may have some ammunition when the Republicans talk next year about crime in the streets.

BILL TO PROHIBIT BANKS FROM SALE OF LOTTERY TICKETS

(Mr. MURPHY of New York (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate Banking and Currency Committee favorably reported a bill which would prohibit banks from selling lottery tickets. As a sponsor of this bill, which has already passed the House, I am happy to see it one step closer to final enactment.

In my own State of New York, where a lottery has recently been established to raise money for education, the bill will have particular impact because banks are the major source of ticket sales. Many people in New York who oppose this bill do so on the grounds that it will damage the lottery and thus the educational system in New York State.

I would like to correct the record on this point. The New York lottery is a failure right now, before this bill has become law and with full benefit of banks acting as ticket agents. The lottery is failing, and thus New York's educational system is threatened, because Governor Rockefeller does not have the political courage to admit the lottery's failure and establish a sound system for financing education in New York State.

It has been obvious from the very first that the lottery could not live up to its expectations. It was supposed to earn \$360 million a year—\$30 million a month—of which \$198 million would be used for education, but so far sales have produced less than one-fifth of this expected volume.

In the first month 6.4 million tickets were sold, in July, 4.1 million, August, less than 6 million, and September, 5.8 million.

If this trend continues, New York City, which budgeted \$55 million in school aid from the lottery, will receive less than \$20 million. This disastrous situation has not, unfortunately, produced an adequate response from the Governor's office. Instead, we are assured that things will be better. After the first month we were told that it was just a problem of advertising, and that a better effort would be made to advertise, but better advertising did not improve lottery sales. Recently we have been told that we need

more sales outlets, but there is no evidence that access to ticket outlets has been a problem. Even the Governor's use of pretty girls in miniskirts to sell tickets did not work, and if cheesecake can not sell tickets, Mr. Speaker, nothing can. Next, the lottery's failure will be blamed on this bill. Maybe that is why Governor Rockefeller is postponing his unavoidable decision, so he can use the bill as a scapegoat for his own failure to act.

But the truth is that it is Governor Rockefeller who has failed. He has failed the people of New York by dodging his responsibility to finance education and by trying instead to revive an inadequate lottery already on its death bed.

If sales were only a few million short of the expected volume, it would be entirely reasonable to try and boost sales, but we are faced with a volume of ticket sales less than one-fifth of that needed to meet New York State's educational budget needs. Even the best Madison Avenue public relations firm could not increase sales by five times, nor can increasing sales outlets accomplish the massive transfusion job. In fact, because they are already behind, sales would have to be increased six or seven times to catch up.

What is needed, and what Governor Rockefeller is avoiding, is the establishment of a sound plan to finance education in the State of New York. The delay now being employed can only cause harm. It was obvious after the first month that the lottery was not an adequate means of financing education; certainly after 2 or 3 months the Governor could have made a decision to find a better means of raising money; now we are in the fifth month of the lottery, and all we hear is that a decision will be made sometime in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I call on Governor Rockefeller to stop his stalling and foot dragging and come forward with a sound plan to finance education in New York State. The answer is not to try and strengthen the lottery, because the lottery has shown beyond any doubt that it is not an adequate means of raising money for education. The sooner Governor Rockefeller recognizes this, the better it will be for New York's educational system. Further delay can serve no purpose, and can only cause serious harm.

NE file
VIOLATION OF CEASE-FIRE IN MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. FARBSTAIN (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, now that all the facts are in, it appears quite clear that Egypt engaged in a serious violation of the cease-fire in the Middle East the other day in sinking the Israel destroyer, *Elath*.

Our Government announced that it found the event "regrettable" but it chose to cast no blame for the aggression.

If the United States seeks to serve as an instrument for peace, Mr. Speaker, it cannot simply be a disinterested bystander.

er to the uncomfortable cease-fire in the Middle East. It must be a positive force. It must be worthy of its power and its tradition in working for stability in the region.

Obviously, our neutrality in dealing with the sinking of the *Elath* did not add to our credibility as such a force. Our behavior was weak. It will, in my view, only serve to encourage the Arabs to transgress the armistice agreement once again, believing they can do so with impunity.

I am aware that we have just announced the impending delivery of 48 Sky Hawk aircraft to Israel and, coming as it has just after the *Elath* incident, this announcement might be interpreted as a rebuke to Egypt. I do not know if it was intended as such, particularly since these planes are also being sent to several Arab countries. The original sale of these Sky Hawks was announced many months ago. But I do not want to be begrudging of our Government's action. In view of Russia's arms deliveries to Syria and Egypt, I must commend the United States for its decision to end its arms embargo to Israel. I cannot, however, interpret this announcement as having any deterrent influence on mischiefmaking Arab chieftains.

I, therefore, propose that the United States do something of which the meaning would be unmistakable. I propose that the United States deliver, under favorable terms, a first-class destroyer to Israel to replace the *Elath*. I am certain that our Navy can spare such a ship. This act on our part would leave no doubt that we intend to contribute to the maintenance of Middle Eastern stability. It will show that we will not stand by to let aggression be rewarded. I urge the President, to whom I have telegraphed my request, to give immediate consideration to the transfer, under favorable terms, of a destroyer of the *Elath's* class to the Israel Government. I am convinced that such an act will serve the cause of peace.

RENT SUPPLEMENTS

(Mr. FARBSTEN (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, this body will have the opportunity, once again, to help less fortunate Americans obtain a decent place to live.

The rent supplement program is coming before us for another hearing. This time, we must not fail to give it the fair and equitable treatment it deserves.

No one program can be the cure-all for all of the ills of poverty. But, the rent supplement program does forge the way for a beginning to the solutions of these ills.

It is a step toward creating a new environment which will allow the elderly, the handicapped and the poor to move out of the abrasive squalor in which they now survive.

Aid from the program is help, where help is needed, and assistance, where assistance is needed.

As of September 14, 1967, reservations of the authority for rent supplement contracts have exhausted the entire \$32 million available.

Reservations cover 445 projects from 301 communities in 47 States, providing 34,168 supplemented units out of 47,764 total units. Well over 600 potential sponsors have expressed interest in the program.

Thus, at the present time the 32 million appropriation is exhausted, leaving a backlog of unsatisfied fund requests at the beginning of fiscal 1968. The unfunded backlog as of September 20 totaled \$20.4 million.

Nearly \$500 million of private mortgage investment for new construction and rehabilitation will be triggered by the \$32 million for supplement payments. The availability of private investment has been assured. On September 13, 1967, the Nation's leading life insurance companies committed \$1 billion to improve urban slum areas. Most of that amount will be invested in rent supplement projects.

The rent supplement legislation contains important provision for enlisting private enterprise in our efforts to increase the Nation's supply of housing for low-income families.

In my view, a vastly expanded use of the private sector of the economy in providing this housing is essential if we are to meet the need for this shelter—a need which grows daily as urban renewal progresses.

In addition, an intangible, but perhaps even more significant benefit flows from the part private enterprise plays in this program. The housing is sponsored by nonprofit organizations or limited dividend corporations, built with Government-underwritten market rate mortgage financing, and privately owned and managed.

Thus, rent supplement tenants live in private housing. Furthermore, they live next door, in the same project, to others who pay full economic rents. As a result, they are not set off from their immediate neighbors or the community because of the rental assistance paid on their behalf by the Government to the landlord.

In every way, they can have the sense of living in regular housing, a sense of belonging.

And in these troubled times, the value of building this kind of morale cannot be overemphasized.

(Mr. FARBSTEN (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FARBSTEN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

REAGAN AND ROMNEY—TWO POLITICAL WARHORSES IN THE SAME SADDLE

(Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, Govs. Ronald Reagan and George Romney have decided to ride the Vietnam issue to what they believe could be political heights.

In all my years in politics I have never seen two men scramble so madly in search of votes on a foreign policy issue.

Reagan advocates what amounts to atomic annihilation of North Vietnam. He says we are really winning, but the President is not telling the American people we are winning.

Romney tells us that he was "brain-washed," that the war is going badly, and that the President is not telling Americans that it is going badly.

I have never seen two allegedly responsible Governors so mangle a vital national issue, with one of them even going around reading other people's mail just to embarrass the President of the United States.

Americans have always liked their politics rough, but this kind of political flip-floppery makes a mockery of bipartisan foreign policy.

What happened to the philosophy of Vandenberg that politics stops at the water's edge?

What ever happened to the time when American leaders considered the demoralizing effects of their comments on our fighting men overseas?

These men forget that they are not just playing with words. They are playing with American lives.

Let us take the politics out of the American commitment to Vietnam.

Let us condemn everyone and anyone who is ready to capitalize politically on life and death issues.

The press of the country has now repudiated these tactics by both Governors Romney and Reagan. I trust that the American people do likewise.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD editorials from the New York Times and the Baltimore News American which justifiably criticize transparent and divisive political tactics:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 21, 1967]

REAGAN FALLS OFF THE HORSE

If the subject were not so serious—discussion of Vietnam policy at the National Governors' Conference—it would be as farcical as an old Ronald Reagan movie. Not "Bedtime for Bonzo" or even "Cattle Queen of Montana" but perhaps, "Accidents Will Happen."

One did, when by mistake Mr. Reagan obtained a radiogram from the White House addressed to former Gov. Price Daniel of Texas, White House liaison man on board the Independence. What did Governor Reagan do? He read the private communication, with full knowledge that it was not addressed to him, and then saw to it that copies were circulated to Republican Governors and reporters aboard ship. The information in the cablegram, concerning gubernatorial positions on Vietnam, was used gleefully by Governor Reagan for political purposes. Vietnam itself, which might have been debated intelligently, was removed from the Governor's agenda.

Commenting about Mr. Reagan's outrageous interception of mail, another governor put it well: "Every man has to live with his own ethics and morality. I don't read other people's mail and messages." Governor Reagan, who has frequently mounted a high moral horse in the tradition of the Old West, or Western, can now come off it.